[*CONFIDENTIAL.*] [No. 28 of 1875.]

REPORT ON NATIVE PAPERS

FOR

The Week ending the 10th July 1875.

RAJSHAHYE SAMACHAR, June 23rd, 1875.

WE give, *in extenso*, the remarks of the *Rájsháhye Samáchár* of the 23rd June on the new Rent Bill: Both landlords and tenants have perceived the urgent need that has arisen for amending Act VIII (B.C.) of 1869, or the amended Act X. But if the Government hope to accomplish this object by the new Bill, and on this account delay the passing of it, their hopes will not be realized. To amend and discuss a lengthy Act like Act VIII may occupy much time. If, however, the passing of the present Bill be deemed necessary for the maintenance of peace, there can be no reason for any delay in passing it into law.

It has become urgently necessary to find out some feasible method of fixing the revenue and collecting rents. Though the new Bill may answer the latter purpose, the former subject is one of such importance that the decision by a summary procedure will not be without danger to both landlord and tenant. We believe that the present relations between these two classes would have been far different if an easy and equitable method of fixing the rents had been in use. The confusion arising from any attempt to decide the rent, where both measurement by chain and rates are concerned, is so great, that to fix the rental by a decision of these is neither easy nor consistent with justice. Moreover, the principles on which the officers who may be entrusted with the duty of deciding the matter are to act are not known at present. Let such a portion of the gross produce of the land as Government thinks proper to assign to the zemindars be fixed, and let the provisions of the new Bill be carried out accordingly. In our opinion, a fourth part of this produce should be assigned as representing the rent due to the zemindar. Of the two propositions for the settlement of a rent-rate made with reference to this Bill by the Hon'ble Baboo Kristo Das Pal, almost all in the country will perhaps prefer the one that seeks to regulate it by a division of the produce. The only point on which a difference of opinion exists is as to what portion should be thus assigned. We do repeatedly ask Government to determine this. Both the zemindar and the ryot are objects of equal regard to the Government, and neither will object to any proposition that comes from it. The matter of determining such a portion was mooted when Act X was passed, but was not carried out owing to an unfounded apprehension that both tenants and landlords, comparing the rates of rent under this new rule, would apply to the courts to have their rents reduced or raised. Yet it is for this reason that the ill-feelings between the zemindars and their tenantry have continued to the present time, and will not cease till the portion each should have of the gross produce is settled. It is our firm conviction that if this were done, the question of rent would be settled by themselves and few

would seek the protection of the courts. Government should no longer be indifferent to this subject. Is it not reasonable that it should be known how rent may be reduced or raised? And when known why should they not consent to it? But though this matter were determined, it can scarcely be expected that by the new Bill the rent will be clearly ascertained. The chief feature of the present Bill is the desire to expedite the administration of justice. From the relations between the zemindars and tenants in certain districts, it would appear that Government has felt the need of doing something very speedily, not only to ensure the collection of rents, but also to determine the rates. Since Government is responsible for the maintenance of peace, we have no right to remonstrate if it affirms that without such provisions as the Bill prescribes the end cannot be secured.

The reason of our earnestness in suggesting that in the new Bill the portion due to the zemindar should be determined, is that some idea may be formed of the rental, and the anxiety in the minds of both landlord and tenant, arising from an ignorance of the principle on which Government acts, will thus be removed. On one point we cannot help expressing our dissent from the views of Government. We cannot admit that revenue officers will despatch the work more readily than civil officers. It is not easy to determine what is an equitable rate of rent; and if Government desires to have the matter determined within a prescribed time, our moonsifs will not be found unequal to the task; but be he who he may, such a judgment cannot be passed without defeating the ends of justice.

It is almost idle to hope for justice and despatch at the same time. It is not likely that under the new Bill the rent will be definitively fixed, and there should be some means to remedy this defect; and here we can see nothing better than the suggestions of the Hon'ble Baboo Digumbar Mitra. All parties will admit that the civil officers are much more cautious, and bear opposition more patiently, and, by their education and practice, are more competent to administer justice than revenue officers. We therefore suggest that the rent-rate fixed under the present Bill should stand for two years only. If, except for some reasonable cause, there be no dispute between landlord and tenant, and the decisions passed be not essentially unfair, both parties will be content; and there would be no loss in subsequently confirming the settlement for ten years. Otherwise, there might be a time fixed, after the expiry of those two years, within which the settlement may be amended through the civil courts at the option of either party. Justice, peace, and despatch will all be thus secured.

Under the provisions of the present Bill rents will be speedily collected. But most of the tenants do not pay by instalments. The absence of any such definite arrangement is a great hindrance to suits for arrears of rent. As the Government take their revenue in four instalments, so four periods of payment of rent, and the amount to be paid at each instalment, should be fixed. This rule should apply to all tenants who do not pay by instalments. It would not do, however, to fix upon the same dates for the payment of rent as are appointed for paying the several instalments of the Government revenue. The dates of the payment of these should be postponed to the end of the months of Ashar, Ashwin, and Choitra, and the middle of Magh; and the dates of the instalments payable by tenants fixed at a month earlier.

We do not understand why those that pay revenue direct to the Government, and their tenantry only, should enjoy the benefit of the present Bill. We cannot pronounce other landholders and ryots guilty of any crime. The benefits to be conferred by the new Bill should be shared by all; otherwise disputes in several estates will necessarily continue, and the object of Government will be frustrated.

Those who think that disputes between landlords and tenants will everywhere be quelled under the new Bill, and who regard it as a substitute for Act VIII or X, are doubtless greatly mistaken in their surmises. We are neither of those that seek to recover for the zemindars the rights lost to them by the passing of Act X, nor of those that propose to obtain an extension of the rights of the tenantry. It is absurd to make such propositions in reference to the present Bill. We would like to see Act X, that is, Act VIII, again amended, and the rights and privileges acquired by the tenantry under Act X so clearly defined that there shall be no room for disputes in future.

2. The same paper observes, in reference to the alleged misrepresentation of the views of Government by the Anglo-Indian and the Vernacular journals, that it is entirely owing to the ignorance in which they are kept by the refusal of the authorities to supply them with accurate official information. The Government is therefore asked to publish a daily paper of its own, containing all information of importance and edited by some one of its able officers.

RAJSHAHYE SAMACHAR, June 23rd, 1875.

3. The *Baráhanayar Samáchár* of the 29th June complains that, owing to the exposure occasionally made in the native papers of the faults of Government officers, a charge of disloyalty to the British Government has been brought against them. Now nothing is more incorrect. It is a well-known fact that educated natives are, as a body, intensely loyal to the British Government; and it is because they hold the Government in great esteem and love it, that they are emboldened to give publicity to the shortcomings of the Government officers. Government also gives heed to the complaints on the subjects made in the native papers, and always shows its willingness to remove the grievances complained of. How should the authorities know the wants and grievances of the people if they were not thus published? Those that selfishly desire to see the vernacular press deprived of its liberty should first of all endeavour to answer the above question. Would it not be sheer folly on our part if we were to rise against a Government (which, again, is physically impossible) under which we live so happily?

BARAHANAGAR SAMACHAR, June 29th, 1875.

4. The same paper complains that Government, in granting new leases of land to the inhabitants of Barahanagar, is taking an enhanced rate of revenue without any satisfactory reason whatever. Not to say anything of the surveys made for the purpose of assessment, this latter has not been equably made. The poor inhabitants are also subjected to great inconvenience and extortion.

BARAHANAGAR SAMACHAR.

5. The *Hindu Ranjiká* of the 30th June observes with regret that litigation has become greatly expensive at the present time from Government draining the purse of the suitors in various ways. What with stamps, the fees to be paid to the peons, and commissions, and the expenses of the witnesses, and especially of Government officers, to seek justice in a law court has become really hard for the poor. The expenses of a suit often exceed its value.

HINDU RANJIKA, June 30th, 1875.

AMRITA BAZAR PATRIKA, July 1st, 1875.

6. The *Amrita Bazar Patriká* of the 1st July adverts with regret to a rumour that, with the abolition of the native civil service examinations, Government has resolved to discontinue its support and encouragement to the gymnastic education of the natives. If it be a fact, observes the editor, a greater misfortune could not befall the country. It is useless to educate and seek to elevate the natives if their physique be not improved and if they continue to die before their time. The native public is requested to take the matter of gymnastic education into their own hands.

AMRITA BAZAR PATRIKA.

7. The same paper does not see what good the country has reaped from the Department of Agriculture established by Government a few years back. It was hoped it would greatly benefit the people; model farms would be established, and the agriculture of the country improved. But very little has been done to realize these expectations. Some farms were indeed set up, but what became of them we do not know. Two things are required to improve the agriculture of the country. (1) The ignorant peasantry should be taught to grow the crops according to their proper order and succession. A want of this knowledge accounts for a large portion of food-producing land in Bengal remaining uncultivated throughout many months in the year. (2) Improvement of the breed of plough cattle. The present breed of bullocks has greatly deteriorated. Government should promptly attend to this matter. Cheap and useful innovations only should be introduced, for the native peasantry is ignorant and poverty-stricken. The plough, rude though it be, should remain as it is, for it is admirably suited to the cattle that draw it. We hope Mr. Hume, instead of his weekly crop reports, will do something that will really benefit the country.

AMRITA BAZAR PATRIKA.

8. A correspondent of the same paper remarks that the Indian Majority Act has been greatly unfair towards the minors under the Court of Wards. Properly speaking, there is none to speak for them. With them the age of majority will be 21 years. We do not understand the reason of this. Doubtless the opinions of able and experienced men were not taken before passing this Act. What is more strange is, that in the Bill the age was limited to 18 years, while in the Act it is 21. It is unjust to those placed under the Court of Wards to keep them away from their property for a large portion of their lives, and that when they are fit to take charge of it. Both mind and body are fully developed in this country on the attainment of the eighteenth year. It is not proper to keep them under tutelage, especially the married ones, after that period. A further term of three years may make them a little more advanced in the knowledge of the English language, but a want of all practical training will be a cause of great inconvenience to them when they do come to take charge of their own affairs. They should therefore be allowed some degree of liberty after their eighteenth year.

EDUCATION GAZETTE, July 2nd, 1875.

9. The *Education Gazette* of the 2nd July says, in reference to the approaching visit of the Prince of Wales, that the people will gladly and loyally defray all the expenses of the visit of their future sovereign, which they believe will do them great good. The British Indian Association should address Government to this effect on behalf of the subjects.

BHARAT SANGSKARAK, July 2nd, 1875.

10. In reference to the recent notification by the Officiating Director of Public Instruction, laying down text-books for the ensuing vernacular and minor scholarship examinations, the *Bhárat Sangskárak* of the 2nd July writes that since a spirit of trade and party favour have found admission into the Education Department, no good can possibly come of it. Doubtless the

Lieutenant-Governor and the Officiating Director of Public Instruction are alone responsible for this.

11. The same paper writes the following in a lengthy editorial headed "Loyalty and the Liberty of the Press:"—There can be no doubt that a feeling of loyalty to the rulers is a virtue of paramount obligation in every subject. That man is really ungrateful, and, in justice, deserves to be punished, who is not respectful towards the sovereign under whose rule his life, honor and property are safe from all danger. But loyalty does not mean flattery of the rulers, calling their defects virtues, and ignoring the distinction between truth and falsehood for their sakes. Loyalty of this description is nothing but meanness and hostility to the king and the country. An intelligent ruler, who really seeks the good of his subjects, hates such flatterers. Finding it advantageous to keep the sovereign in good humour, the majority of the people often seek to gratify his ear by false professions, and he who believes them ruins his kingdom. Some of the sovereigns of the Tudor and the Stuart dynasties in England, in spite of their gross oppressions on the people, loved to hear their own adulations. The consequence of this was a great rebellion, the execution of a king, and a change in the form of government. All wise rulers, however, seek, by every means in their power, to ascertain the defects of their administrations and the opinions of the subjects in regard to themselves. This course was followed in the "reign of Ráma," the ideal rule of perfection. In fact, it is impossible for a prince to be a good administrator unless he is first prepared to sacrifice his personal interests and comforts for the good of the public. And it is because the princes of the present time are disposed to hear their own shortcomings told them that liberty has been given to the press, and they may freely discuss the merits and demerits of the administration. It is needless to add that both the sovereign and the subjects are immensely benefited in this way. A strange event, however, has occurred in this nineteenth century, which deserves to live in the memory of man. In India great agitation is made on the subject of the liberty of the native press, with the sole object of curtailing or altogether destroying their liberty. The chief movers of this agitation are the editors of Anglo-Indian journals. They seem to say, by their conduct, that whatever censures, reproofs, or insults are to be administered to Government might be so administered by themselves; and that the natives, being a conquered race, have no business to raise their voice against the action of the authorities; if they do, it is sedition. Our rulers also are so credulous as, induced by the misrepresentations of these Anglo-Indian editors, frequently to enact stringent laws. We can, however, safely assert that what little of spirit the native papers possess is entirely owing to the example of these Anglo-Indian prints. They have never surpassed the English editors in abusing Government. What did the latter not say of Government during the progress of the Baroda affair. But we find that no one makes any mention of that; while a few native papers that wrote somewhat strongly on the subject are being dragged into publicity, and the need of humbling the spirit of the whole native press expatiated on. Government has its "Sedition Act," and can easily bring to punishment any paper that is found to write seditiously; and if some yet more stringent law is necessary it may be enacted; but it should be applicable equally to both the Anglo-Indian and the native papers, and there will be no complaint. Great injustice will be done, and the object of Government also will be frustrated, if, instead of this, a conspiracy is made to deprive the native papers alone of their liberty. Does Government hope that the Anglo-Indian papers by

Bharat Sangskaran, July 2nd, 1875.

themselves will be able to keep it informed of the feelings, wants, and grievances of the people? and does it hope to do its duty and acquire reputation by simply gagging the mouths of native editors? The real feelings of the twenty crores of men who live under the British Government are pourtrayed only in the native papers, and if these are prevented, by fear, to give vent to them, the feelings will not be destroyed, but will continue to work secretly. No prince has ever by force extorted feelings of loyalty from his subjects; it is his virtues that alone can endear him to them, and beget in their hearts true confidence. Our governors should seek to remove the defects which may give rise to any seemingly disloyal expressions in the native papers that come to their notice, and they will thus secure the undivided allegiance of the subjects.

We are taught one great lesson from these repeated agitations against the native papers. Let us not, through fear of the punishment Government can inflict on us, fail to discharge the duties we have undertaken. If we find our rulers do a clearly wrong act, in the interest of truth and the country, and our sovereign, we shall freely expose it; and then, if we are unjustly punished, we shall patiently endure the punishment, for it will ultimately do us good. But it behoves us to remember at the same time that we should not be disloyal to Government in our eagerness to expose its faults. The faults of Government should be dealt with in the same respectful tone which we adopt when exposing the shortcomings of a superior. We should be the more cautious in this respect as it is a foreign Government we have to deal with, which is not fully able to understand our real feelings, and is apt to be suspicious about us on trifling grounds. Those of our contemporaries who take a pride in only abusing and ridiculing Government should perceive their errors and adopt a milder tone of writing. We may think that we are simply acting petulantly, like children, but those before whom we do this may not understand us, and then evil instead of beneficial consequences will result.

GRAMBARTA PRAKASHIKA, July 3rd, 1875.

12. The *Grámbártá Prakáshiká* of the 3rd July requests His Honor to appoint only really competent men to the Book Committee, those proficient in both English and the Vernacular, and able to judge of the capacities of native students. Men like Babu Rájendra Lál Mitra, Pandit Ishwara Chandra Vidyáságara, and the Rev. K. M. Banerjea, are fit for the purposes of the Committee, which, it is hoped, will render a real service to the education of the young. The editor, however, is sorry to note that Messrs. Lethbridge and Clarke, who have but little knowledge of the vernacular, have been entrusted with the task of selecting the text-books, and that some wretched translations have been prescribed in this way.

HINDU HITOISHINI, July 3rd, 1875.

13. The *Hindu Hitoishiní* of the 3rd July is afraid that the liberty of the native journals is really in danger. Though they have not done anything beyond complaining of their grievances and seeking redress according to the laws and professions of the Government, still the persistent hostility of the Anglo-Indian journals, and the recent uninformed remarks of some of the English papers, as the *Pall Mall Gazette*, towards them, may influence the authorities to deprive the native press of its liberty. We, however, hope that Government will seriously consider the subject before taking any definite action. It will perceive that by preventing the people from expressing their feelings it will only give scope for the secret working of discontent. Such a measure will moreover be a lasting reproach to Government.

HOWRAH HITAKARI, July 4th, 1875.

14. The *Howrah Hitakarí* of the 4th July remarks that the selection, by the Lieutenant-Governor of the Bengali translations of the historical

manuals compiled in English by Messrs. Lethbridge and Clarke for the vernacular and minor scholarship examinations has been a most injudicious and arbitrary act. The translations are miserable.

15. The *Sádháraní* of the 4th July, alluding to a rigorous system of government which, according to the *Sahachar*, it was the great object of Sir George Campbell to introduce into Bengal, observes:—In our opinion it would greatly benefit us if a rigorous system of administration were introduced into this country. We have become so extremely tame that a little petting on the part of our masters makes us wag our tails and lick the dust of their feet. But if, instead of this, they would strike us and thus teach us to cry out, we might in time attain to something worth having. We have repeatedly said before, and still say, that the country cannot expect any good from a Grey or a Temple. We want a governor, hardy, large-hearted, active, quick-sighted and terrible as Campbell. SADHARANI, July 4th, 1875.

16. The same paper remarks that the English Government is theoretically a most perfect form of administration, though it is far otherwise in practice. Through the faults of individual officers injustice is frequently done and the innocent suffer. The Government of India again pursues a strange policy. It is despotic and liberal by turns, and hence its acts are grossly inconsistent with its professions. This has been signally shewn during the recent Baroda affairs. SADHARANI.

17. The following is from the *Dacca Prakásh* of the 4th July:—We publish below, for the information of the authorities, a letter received from Jamalpore in Mymensingh, and written against Mr. T. D. Donough, the Deputy Magistrate of the place. We hope that due attention will be paid to the subject. DACCA PRAKASH, July 4th, 1875.

"Sir,—Yourself and your readers are not perhaps unaware that Mr. T. D. Donough has been ruling over us here for about the last eight years. About his character much has been before written in your paper and to the authorities. But no good, rather evil, has come out of that. The authorities having failed to make any enquiry into the truth of the graver charges brought against him (such as partiality in decision and retieving presents), the Deputy Magistrate has become bolder than ever and acts in a most arbitrary manner. He now looks upon not a few men of the place as his enemies. So that if he but once finds an opportunity there will be no escape for them. What misfortunes may not befal a man when a judge, and one who is responsible for the maintenance of peace, is hostile to him?" The editor then proceeds to refer to many illegal acts of Mr. Donough and earnestly requests Government to transfer him elsewhere.

18. The *Som Prakash* of the 5th July dwells on the injury done to the health and usefulness of the natives by the use of opiates, and remarks that Government is committing an extremely sinful act by its monopoly in the trade of opium. If, for financial considerations, it is absolutely impossible for Government altogether to give up this obnoxious trade, which it is morally bound to do, it should at least desist from producing the drug at its own cost and risk, but should leave it to others. Its share in this immoral transaction will thus be lightened. It can, however, recoup itself for the loss of revenue by charging a high rate of duty on the article. SOM PRAKASH, July 5th, 1875.

19. The same paper is gratified to find that the native civil service has been abolished. It was doing much evil. The standard of educational efficiency as public servants, and the aim of the candidates were considerably lowered by this institution. It was a mistake to fancy that the native civil SOM PRAKASH.

service would foster gymnastic education among the natives, for few would seek admission into it. Besides, mere physical education hardly produces any substantial good.

SAMACHAR, July 5th, 1875.

20. The *Sahachar* of the 5th July writes a long editorial on the text-books used in the schools; and observes that the native authors and the cause of vernacular literature generally have been greatly injured by the injudicious measure of Government in prescribing some worthless productions for the vernacular and minor scholarship examinations, to the exclusion of deserving works by competent natives. This is no doubt due to the advice of some interested men. The British Indian Association is requested to take up the matter and represent to Government the true merits of the case. In conclusion, the Lieutenant-Governor is exhorted not to interfere in the selection of vernacular text-books. Let the production of educational works be left to public competition, and much good will be done to the country.

SAMACHAR.

21. The same paper asks the authorities to re-measure the land in Panchannogram which pays revenue direct to the Government, and establish a permanent settlement in it. The existing measurements are almost all of them incorrect.

SULABHA SAMACHAR, July 6th, 1875.

22. In a letter to the *Sulabha Samáchár* of the 6th July, purporting to be a petition from some of the poor inhabitants of Debipore, in the sub-division of Diamond Harbour, the writer complains that they have been put to extreme inconvenience from the sub-registrar of Debipore and Bankipore thanas having removed the sub-registry office from Ustir Bazar, where it was conveniently situated, to his native village, which is at a distance of about 15 miles on the average from both the thanas. Government is requested to establish the office in a convenient locality.

SAMBAD PRABHAKAR, July 1st, 1875.

23. A correspondent from Assam, writing to the *Sambád Prabhákar* of the 1st July, remarks, in reference to the translation of *Chákar Darpan*, or the *Tea-planter's Mirror*, that has recently appeared in the *Englishman*, and the comments of that journal on the same, that it would have been well for the people if enquiries had been made about the doings of these planters, of whose oppressions we have such a firm conviction. It is almost impossible to give publicity to all the unjust proceedings of the planters in Assam, for it is not easy to adduce sufficient evidence in a court of law to prove them. Possibly the oppressions actually practised on the laborers are severer than those depicted in the *Chákar Darpan*. Of course there are honorable exceptions among the planters, some of whom are really good men. The majority, however, are otherwise. In Assam, Government itself forces laborers to do its work without any remuneration; but the helpless people patiently submit to it. The planters also resort to this method; in fact, they cannot, as it were, do without it.

BENGALI TRANSLATOR'S OFFICE,
The 10th July 1875.

JOHN ROBINSON,
Government Bengali Translator.

List of Native Newspapers received and examined for the Week ending the 10th July 1875.

No.	Names.	Place of publication.	Monthly, weekly, or otherwise.	Date.
1	"Satya Prakásh" ...	Bánaripárá, Burrisál ...	Bi-Monthly ...	2nd fortnight of Joisto 1282 B.S.
2	"Baráhanagar Samáchár" ...	Baráhanagar ...	Ditto ...	29th June.
3	"Rungpore Dik Prakásh" ...	Kákiniá, Rungpore ...	Weekly ...	17th ditto.
4	"Burrisál Bártábaha" ...	Burrisál	Ditto ...	23rd ditto.
5	"Suhrid" ...	Muktágáchá, Mymensing	Ditto ...	29th ditto.
6	"Hindu Ranjiká" ...	Bauleah, Rájshahye ...	Ditto ...	30th ditto.
7	"Amrita Bazar Patriká" ...	Calcutta	Ditto ...	1st July.
8	"Education Gazette" ...	Hooghly	Ditto ...	2nd ditto.
9	"Bhárat Sangsákrak" ...	Harinávi, 24-Pergunnahs	Ditto ...	2nd ditto.
10	"Moorshedabad Patriká" ...	Berhampore	Ditto ...	2nd ditto.
11	"Grámbártá Prakáshiká" ...	Comercolly	Ditto ...	3rd ditto.
12	"Hindu Hitoishini" ...	Dacca	Ditto ...	3rd ditto.
13	"Dacca Prakásh" ...	Ditto	Ditto ...	4th ditto.
14	"Howrah Hitakarí" ...	Bethar, Howrah ...	Ditto ...	4th ditto.
15	"Sádháraní" ...	Chinsurah	Ditto ...	4th ditto.
16	"Som Prakásh ...	Chángripotáh, 24-Pergunnahs.	Ditto ...	5th ditto.
17	"Sahachar" ...	Calcutta	Ditto ...	5th ditto.
18	"Sulabha Samáchár" ...	Ditto	Ditto ...	6th ditto.
19	"Samáchár Chandriká" ...	Ditto	Bi-weekly ...	9th ditto.
20	"Sambád Prabhákar" ...	Ditto	Daily ...	1st to 3rd July.
21	"Urdu Guide" (*in Urdu*) ...	Ditto	Weekly ...	3rd July.
22	"Jám-Jehán-numá" (*in Persian*).	Ditto	Ditto ...	9th ditto.
23	"Rájsháhye Samáchár" ...	Karachmáriá, Rájshahye	Ditto ...	23rd June.

Bengal Secretariat Press.

B. E.—Reg. No. 174.